(क) क्या योजना आयोग के सदस्य श्री वी० कृष्णामूर्ति की अध्यक्षता में आयोग के पुनर्गठन हेतु गठित विशेष पैनल ने अपना प्रतिवेदन प्रस्तुत कर दिया है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो तत्संबंधी ब्यौरा क्या है; और

(ग) आयोग और उसके सचिवालय के सदस्यों की संख्या कम करने के बारे में सरकार की प्रतिक्रिया क्या है ?

योजना और कार्यक्रम कार्यान्वयन मंत्रालय के राज्य मंत्री और गैर-पारम्परिक ऊर्जा स्रोत मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सुखराम) : (क) जी हां ।

(ख) योजना आयोग के पुनर्गठन तथा प्रबंध के बारे में गठित टास्क फोर्स की अंतरिम रिपोर्ट प्राप्त हो गई है । अंतरिम रिपोर्ट में की गयी सिफारिशों की मुख्य विशेषताएं हैं कि योजना आयोग को एक "थिंक टैंक" की भूमिका निभानी चाहिए तथा सुझाया गया है कि केन्द्रीय मंत्रालयों एवं राज्य सरकारों के साथ आयोग में और अधिक अंतःक्रिया को प्रोत्साहित करते हुए इस उद्देश्य को ध्यान में रखकर प्रभागों का पुनर्गठन करना चाहिए । अत्याधिक कुशलता प्राप्त करने के लिए गैर-सरकारी परामर्शदाताओं को शामिल करने की प्रणाली को सुदृढ़ करने तथा आवश्यक इनपुट प्रदान करने में विभिन्न तैक्षणिक एवं अनुसंधान संगठनों को शामिल करने की आवश्यकता है । आयोग को सर्वोत्तम गुणवत्ता वाले कार्मिकों को प्राप्त करने का प्रयास करना चाहिए तथा वरिष्ठता, योग्यता तथा कार्य-कुशलता के आधार पर कुल संख्या के अंतर्गत उच्च ग्रेड के पदों पर नियुक्ति में लोचशीलता होनी चाहिए ।

(ग) सिफारिशों के अनुसार आयोग में पदों की संख्या कम की गई है ।

Revision of Modified Gadgii Formula

419. SHRI KAMAL. MORARKA: Will the Minister of PALNNING AND PROG-RAMME' IMPLEMENTATION be pleassd to state :

(a) whether Government have further revised the modified Gadgii Formula :

(b) if so, the reasons for the revision;

(e) what is the manner in which the revised formula differs from the modified formula: and

(d) what is the manner in which the revised formula will be beneficial to the baekward States?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROG-RAMME IMPLEMENTATION AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MfNJS TRY OF NON CONVENTIONAL ENERGY SOURCES (SHRI SUKH RAM): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b)The Chief Ministers of some of the States hove been suggesting changes in the formula to take into account their concerns.

(c)Comparative picture of criteria and weightage under Modified Gadgil formula and formulae *vs* revised in Gcioler, 1990 and in December, 1991 is shown in the Statement. *(See* below).

(d) 30% share of Special Cutegorv States has been restored under the formula revised in December, 1991. As for the non-Special Category States, the revised formula gives considerable weightage to the Criteria of population and per capita income accounting to 85 per cent which favours the backward States. The criterion of' special problems carrying weightage of 7.5; per cent also favours theim

Statement

Criteria and Weightage under Modified Gadgil formula and formulae as revised in October, 1990 *andin December,* 1991 *for allocation of CentralAmi/HomefarStates' Plan,*

(Weightage %)

Modified Gadgil Criteria Formula (1980)		NDC Revised Formula (1990)	NDC Revised Formula (1991)
A. Special Category States (10) of 10 States excluding North Eastern States,	30%share of 10 States Including North	30% share of 10 States including North	30 share of 10 States excluding North
B. *Non-Special Category States* (15)			
(0 *Population* 1(1971)	60.0	55.0	60.0
(ii) *Per Capita Income of which*	20.0	25.0	25.0
(a) According to the 'deviation' method covering only the States with per capita income below the national average.	20. 0	20.0	20.0
(b) According to the 'distance' method covering all the fifteen States.		5.0	5.0
(iii) *Performance of which*		5.0	7.5
(a) Tax effort	10.0	. —	2.5
(b) Fiscal management		5.0	2.5
(c) National objectives	—	—	2.5
(d) *Special Problems*	10.0	15.0	7.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0

NOTE : 1. Fiscal Management is assessed as the difference between States' own total Plan resources estimated at the time of finalising Annual Wans end their actual performance considering latest five years.

2. Under the criterion of the performance inrespect of certain pjsagrarames of national priorities the approved formula covers four objectives vie. (1) population control, (ii) ciiminational of illiteracy, (iii) on-time completion of externally aided projects, and (iv) success in land reforms.

Monitoring of Projects in Andhra Pradesh

320. DR. YELAMANCHILE SIVAJI: Will the Minister of PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be pleased to state :

(a) the names of the projects in Andhra Pradesh that are being monitored by the Central Government; and

(b) what is the detailed assessment of the same in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION AND THE MINSTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF NON CONVENTIONAL ENERGY SOURCES (SHRI SUKH RAM):

(a) A list of the 25 central projects in Andhja Pradesh, each costing Ra. 20 crore and above, excluding inter-state projects like pewesi translation liips, railway lines etc. passing through the State, being monitored by the Department of Programme Implementation, as on 31st March, 1992 is annexed as statement *(See* below).

(b) The total anticipated cost of the above 25 projects is Rs. 10,869.34 crore. Of these 11 project* are on schedule, 13 projects are behind schedule and the date of cctrnmisskmiSfi m respect of the remaining 1 project is not yet flnnsd-up. Thirteen (13) projects are affected by cost overnins with respect to the latest suctioned cost.